

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are currently pending in this application, with Claims 1, 12, and 14 being the only independent claims.

Examiner grant is thanked for indicating that Claims 12-15 are allowed, and that Claims 3-7, 10 and 11 would be allowable if rewritten in independent from.

Thus, the only claims presently at issue are Claims 1, 2, 8 and 9, Claim 1 being independent.

At the outset, an Information Disclosure Statement was filed on February 28, 2001. Consideration of the documents cited in that Information Disclosure Statement has not yet been indicated. It is therefore respectfully requested that in the next communication that an initialed copy of the form PTO-1449 that was included with the Information Disclosure Statement indicating consideration of the cited documents be included.

Rejection of Claim 1

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,513,605, hereinafter *Ohara*. As detailed below, there are significant differences between *Ohara*'s disclosure and Claim 1.

One of the differences between *Ohara* and Claim 1 has to do with the processors that process image data. Claim 1 defines an image processing apparatus having a combination of features including a first processor which processes image data in correspondence to a first operation, and a second processor that processes image data in correspondence to a second operation.

Ohara does not disclose at least a first and a second processor which each process image data. The Official Action relies on the calculation circuit 25 and the correction data memory 23 for a disclosure of a first and second processor which process image data. However, the correction data memory 23 does not process image data. Rather, the correction data memory 23 contains correction data that is used to pre-heat the heating elements R1 to Rn. In column 5, lines 42-56 it is stated that "the first energization means that pre-heating is effected by supplying currents to the respective heating elements R1 to Rn in accordance with the density correction data memory 23 which corresponds to the variations of the resistances..." Also, beginning in column 5, line 67 it is described that the density correction data correspond to the variations of the resistances and are for checking whether the resistance of each of the heating elements R1 to Rn is higher or lower than the average value of the resistances. *Ohara* does not disclose that the correction data memory 23 processes image data, and rather discloses functions different than processing image data, i.e., pre-heating and checking resistances. For at least this reason, the correction data memory 23 in *Ohara* does not process image data, and *Ohara* does not anticipate Claim 1.

Another difference between *Ohara* and Claim 1 has to do with the fact that the correction data memory 23 is not a processor. The Official Action proposes that the correction data memory 23 is a processor because supplying of correction data by the correction data memory 23 is a process. This is not a reasonable interpretation at least because for a device to be a processor, it must process something. The mere exportation of data from the correction data memory 23, absent any processing, does not make the correction data memory 23 a processor. The

American Heritage Dictionary defines a processor as “one that processes, especially an apparatus for preparing, treating, or converting material.” In computer science, a processor is defined as “a computer, a central processing unit, or a program that translates another program into a form acceptable by the computer being used.” The definitions of a processor conspicuously lack any reference to the exportation of saved data, thus bolstering Applicants’ position that it is not reasonable to interpret the correction data memory 23 as being a processor.

For the reasons stated above, Claim 1 is not anticipated by *Ohara* and it is requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections of Claims 2, 8 and 9

Claims 2, 8 and 9 depend from Claim 1 and are therefore allowable at least for the reasons set forth earlier with respect to independent Claim 1, and because they define features that additionally define over *Ohara*.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons stated above, it is requested that all the rejections be withdrawn, and that this application be allowed.

Should any questions arise in connection with this application, or should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in

resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Buchanan Ingersoll PC

(including attorneys from BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS)

Date: Tues., September 6, 2005

By: Kevin Brayton McGoff
Kevin Brayton McGoff
Registration No. 53,297

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620